

² Defendants Gadsen, Jr. and Brown's objections were due by August 10, 2022, and Plaintiff's objections were due by August 13, 2022. *See* ECF Nos 73 & 74.

absence of objections to the R & R, the Court is not required to give any explanation for adopting the Magistrate Judge's recommendations. *See Camby v. Davis*, 718 F.2d 198, 199–200 (4th Cir. 1983). The Court reviews only for clear error in the absence of an objection. *See Diamond v. Colonial Life & Acc. Ins. Co.*, 416 F.3d 310, 315 (4th Cir. 2005) (stating that "in the absence of a timely filed objection, a district court need not conduct de novo review, but instead must 'only satisfy itself that there is no clear error on the face of the record in order to accept the recommendation'" (quoting Fed. R. Civ. P. 72 advisory committee's note)).

Having found no clear error, the Court **ADOPTS** the Magistrate Judge's R & R [ECF No. 73] and **GRANTS IN PART AND DENIES IN PART** Defendants Gadsen, Jr. and Brown's motion for partial dismissal [ECF No. 55] so that Plaintiff's § 1983 claims for monetary damages against Defendants Gadsen, Jr. and Brown in their official capacities are **DISMISSED** *without prejudice*. Plaintiff's § 1983 claims for injunctive relief against Defendants Gadsen, Jr. and Brown and Plaintiff's § 1983 claims for monetary damages against Defendants Gadsen, Jr. and Brown in their individual capacities remain pending.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Florence, South Carolina
August 29, 2022

s/ R. Bryan Harwell
R. Bryan Harwell
Chief United States District Judge